B87 A8 cont.

ns or more under conditions in that said other substrate is cooled to a temperature lower than room temperature, so as to convert said non-single crystal silicon contained in an irradiated area corresponding to said cross sectional area to a polycrystalline silicon at a time.

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Official Action mailed January 19, 2001. Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and the following remarks are courteously requested.

By the foregoing amendment, the specification and each of the pending claims have been amended. Thus, claims 11 to 12, 17 to 18, 27 to 28, 39 to 40, 53 to 54, 63 to 65, and 73 to 74 are currently pending for the Examiner's consideration.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of an informality. These objections are respectfully traversed, as the specification appears to be very clear despite lacking in perfect grammar. However, a complete review of the specification will be made, and corrections in terms of idiomatic English will be made.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 12, 17, 18, 27, 28, 39, 40, 53, 54, 63-65, 73, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. These claims have been carefully reviewed in light of the Examiner's comments. Following this amendment, all the

remaining claims are believed to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 11, 39, 53, 63, 64, 73 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. '291, issued to Zhang et al., ("Zhang"). The Examiner rejected claims 12, 18, 28, 40, 54, 65, 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. '291, issued to Zhang et al., ("Zhang") in view of U.S. Patent No. '744, issued to Tanaka et al., (Tanaka"). The Examiner also rejected claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. '291, issued to Zhang et al., ("Zhang") in view of 86 USPQ 70, issued to Japikse, ("Japikse"). The Examiner also rejected claim 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. '291, issued to Zhang et al., ("Zhang") in view of 86 USOQ 70, issued to Japikse, ("Japikse").

These rejections are respectfully traversed in light of the amendments made to the claims. More particularly, the amendments regarding the height of the layers of amorphous polysilicon film are not taught or suggested by the Tanaka or the Zhang patents. The Zhang process is usable for making polycrystalline silicon film from an amorphous semiconductor film of 100 nm. There is no teaching or suggestion in Zhang or the remaining cited prior art references that the Zhang

process could be applied to a thinner amorphous film. In fact, the present specification clearly teaches that the problems associated with the Zhang process (merely eliminating hydrogen from amorphous semiconductor films without laser processing) are overcome by the presently claimed invention. Finally, the thickness of the amorphous film definitely attributes structure to the final claimed product, and is not merely a product-by-process limitation. Consequently, the rejections of the pending claims should be overcome.

For the foregoing reasons, all the claims now pending in the present application are believed to be clearly patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: 19 April 2001

Ronald P. Kananen
Registration No. 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER, PLLC
Lion Building
1233 20th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
Tel: (202) 955-3750
Fax: (202) 955-3751
Customer No.: 23353